

REMARKS

In the response dated August 4, 2008, claim 1 was replaced with new claims 62 and 64. Claims 2-4, 6, 11-12, 18 and 20 originally depended from claim 1, but were amended to depend from new claim 62.

The Notice dated August 29, 2008 states that the amendment filed August 4, 2008 is not fully responsive to the prior office action because it does not contain a statement about how the new claims and amended claims relate to previous restriction requirements.

A statement follows.

Restriction requirement dated 6/22/05

The restriction requirement dated 6/22/05 required restriction between a clamping system and a clamping method. Claims drawn to the clamping system were elected. Claims 2-4, 6, 11-12, 18, 20 and 62-64 all recite clamping systems, so they are all elected claims.

Restriction requirement dated 7/28/05

The restriction requirement dated 7/28/05 required restriction between the alleged species of Figures 1, 3A, 4, 5A, 7 and 8. The so-called species of Figure 1 was elected.

Figure 1 illustrates an example of a system 25 for clamping a top work piece 12 to an underlying work piece 14. The system 25 comprises a crib 16 for supporting the underlying work piece 14; and a chain of interspersed coupling units 30 and force applying units 40. Thus, claim 62 recites elements of the elected species of Figure 1.

Figure 1 also illustrates an example of a system 25 for clamping aircraft skin 12 having a complex surface shape to an aircraft frame 14. The system 25 comprises a

crib 16 configured to support the aircraft frame 14; and a chain of interspersed coupling units 30 and force applying units 40. Thus, claim 64 recites elements of the elected species of Figure 1.

As a result of this second restriction requirement, claims 3, 6, 18 and 20 were withdrawn from consideration. Claims 2, 4, 7-8, 11-12 and 14-15 were examined. Had claims 62 and 64 been presented earlier, they too would have been examined.

Restriction requirement dated 10/9/07

The restriction requirement dated 10/0/07 required restriction between claims 1, 2, 4, 7-8, 11-12 and 14-15 drawn to a first subcombination having a single pivot ball and first and second arms; claims 21, 25-26, and 29-31 drawn to a second subcombination; claims 40-42, 45 and 61 drawn to a third subcombination; and claims 52-55 drawn to a fourth subcombination. The first subcombination was elected on 11/8/2007.

The claims drawn to the second, third and fourth subcombination have all been cancelled. Claims 7-8 and 14-15 have also been cancelled.

New claim 63 recites a pivot ball, a first arm and a second arm. Thus, it recites elements of the elected subcombination. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to depend from new claim 63.

Conclusion

Claims 62 and 64 should be examined as they are generic claims that replaced generic claim 1. Claims 2, 4, 11-12 and 63 should also be examined.

The response filed August 4, 2008 indicated an incorrect status for claim 3, 6, 18 and 20, as these claims were previously withdrawn from consideration. The correct status (Withdrawn-currently amended) is shown in the section above for amendments to the claims.

Examination of claims 2, 4, 11-12, and 62-64 is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to further discuss this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: September 2, 2008